GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW SHEET FOR MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECT

GEF ID:	**9795**		
Country/Region:	**Azerbaijan**		
Project Title:	**Forest Resources Assessment and Monitoring to Strengthen Forest Knowledge Framework in Azerbaijan**		
GEF Agency:	**FAO**	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Multi Focal Area**
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**LD-2 Program 3; CCM-2 Program 4;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$50,000**	Project Grant:	**$1,484,247**
Co-financing:	**$7,000,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$8,484,247**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Ulrich Apel**	Agency Contact Person:	**Peter Pechacek**

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework?[1]	04/06/2017 UA: Yes. Cleared	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	04/06/2017 UA: Yes. Please note that project design has been discussed in context with the previously submitted ID #9396. The resubmitted project has been re-designed as a MSP. Cleared	
	3. Is the project consistent with	04/06/2017 UA:	

[1] For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
	the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	Yes. Cleared	
Project Design	4. Does the project sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	04/06/2017 UA: Yes. Cleared	
	5. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	04/06/2017 UA: Yes. Cleared	
	6. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	04/06/2017 UA: Yes. Cleared	
	7. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	04/06/2017 UA: Yes. Cleared	
	8. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	04/06/2017 UA: Yes. Cleared	
	9. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to	04/06/2017 UA: Yes. Cleared	

[2] Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
	enhance climate resilience)		
	10. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	04/06/2017 UA: Yes. Cleared	
	11. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	04/06/2017 UA: If the carbon benefits are included in the CC tracking tool, we assume that those are created with CC funding, which is fine. In this case, please remove from the LD tracking tool to avoid double counting. We kindly ask you to make conservative estimates to avoid to high ex ante estimates. Please revise figures in case estimates have changed. Please also submit EX-ACT tool for our records. 05/10/2017 UA. Has been addressed and EX-ACT tool submitted. Cleared	
	12. *Only for Non-grant Instrument:* Has a reflow calendar been presented?	n/a	
	13. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	04/06/2017 UA: Yes. Cleared	
	14. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures	04/06/2017 UA: Yes. Included in the project document.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
	results with indicators and targets?	Cleared	
	15. Does the project have description of knowledge management plan?	04/06/2017 UA: Yes. Cleared	
Availability of Resources	16. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	03/21/2017 UA: Please note that council decision GEF/C.51/04 - Update on GEF-6 Resource Availability requests the GEF Secretariat to effectively and proactively manage the projected shortfall in GEF-6. The funding levels identified in the proposed projects appear to be consistent with the original STAR allocation for Azerbaijan; however, due to the shortfall, prioritization in the project portfolio and potentially reductions in project resource allocation is needed. GEFSEC is unable to proceed with the review without additional guidance from the OFP. GEFSEC has already contacted the OFP and is awaiting OFP guidance. UPDATE 04/06/2017 UA: OFP has informed GEFSEC by email that this project should be prioritized with the remaining resources. Currently, Azerbaijan has $1.68 million STAR resources remaining. Please make	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
		the necessary adjustment throughout the CEO approval request and project document. 05/10/2017 UA: Budget has been adjusted.	
	• The focal area allocation?	04/06/2017 UA: Azerbaijan is allowed to make marginal adjustment of up to $2 million, the share of 50/50 LD/CC is fine. Cleared	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access	n/a	
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	n/a	
	• Focal area set-aside?	n/a	
Recommendations	17. Is the MSP being recommended for approval?	04/06/2017 UA: No. Please address comments. 05/10/2017 UA: The project is technically cleared by the Program Manager. In order to recommend the project for CEO approval, please provide an updated OFP endorsement letter that reflects the requested amounts. 06/02/2017 UA: OFP endorsement letter received. The project is recommended for CEO approval.	
Review Dates	First Review	March 27, 2017	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
	Additional Review (as necessary)	April 06, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	May 10, 2017	